UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/744,097	01/16/2001	David A Shafer	1414.501U2	2981

7590 12/12/2006

DR. BENJAMIN ADLER
C/O ADLER & ASSOCIATION
8011 CANDLE LANE
HOUSTON, TX 77071

EXAMINER	
FREDMAN, JEFFREY NORMAN	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
1637	

DATE MAILED: 12/12/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/744,097	SHAFER, DAVID A	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Jeffrey Fredman	1637	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *20 October 2006*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *28,30-35 and 59-62* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) *62* is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *28,30-35,59 and 60* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *61* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Election/Restrictions

1. Applicant requests that the sequence election be withdrawn because the invention will not work if the claims are limited to one nucleotide sequence. In this case, there are generic claims and specific claims drawn to SEQ ID NO: 76. The restriction requirement will currently be maintained. Claim 62 is drawn to nonelected sequences and is therefore withdrawn from prosecution. If a generic claim is ever found to be allowable, Applicant will be permitted to rejoin at least one additional sequence at that time. Until such time however, the restriction requirement is maintained and remains final.

Claim Interpretation

2. Applicant's amendment has significantly altered the claims. Claim 28 now describes a structure for the probe unit in which two probes are hybridized to one another with certain regions. The claim discusses a first and second universal probe linker, but is open to situations where these linkers are identical or different. The method continues to use the open transitional phrase "comprising". As MPEP 2111.03 notes "The transitional term "comprising", which is synonymous with "including," "containing," or "characterized by," is inclusive or open-ended and does not exclude additional, unrecited elements or method steps."

Arguably, the claim amendment is now drawn to a different invention than that originally claimed, but in view of the RCE, the amendment will be entered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The rejection of claims 28, 30-35, 59-61 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, are withdrawn in view of the amendment.

4. The rejection of claims 28, 30-35, 59-61 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, are withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The rejection of claims 28 and 30-32 and 61 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wang et al (U.S. Patent 4,925,785) is withdrawn in view of the amendment.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 28, 30-35 and 59-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang et al (U.S. Patent 4,925,785) in view of Urdea et al (U.S. Patent 5,681,697).

Wang teaches a method for detecting a target nucleotide sequence (see abstract) comprising:

a) rendering the target nucleotide sequence substantially single stranded to give a single-stranded target nucleotide sequence (see column 3, lines 64-65 and figure 4C),

b) hybridizing the single stranded target nucleotide sequence with a nucleic acid probe unit (see figure 4C and example 2, columns 11 and 12) where two oligonucleotides are overlapped (hybridized, see figure 4C and column 12),

wherein the first oligonucleotide comprising three segments sequentially (see figure 4),

i) a first universal probe linker on one end that hybridizes to a universal reporter linker of a reporter by does not bind the single stranded target sequence (see in figure 4C and example 2, where the Pj probe has a region A, which is a universal linker that binds to the A' probe region and functions as the universal reporter linker and this region does not bind the single stranded target sequence)

ii) a central sequence complementary to the single stranded target sequence (see figure 4C and example 2, where there is a region of the Pj probe which is hybridizing to the single stranded target) and

iii) an overlap linker on the other end which can hybridize to the matching overlap linker of the second oligonucleotide (see the terminal region of the Pj probe, B, which hybridizes to the B' region of the second oligonucleotide),

wherein the second oligonucleotide comprises two segments sequentially,

i) a matching overlap linker that is hybridized to the overlap linker of the first oligonucleotide (see figure 4C, where second probe is hybridized to the Pj probe at the B region)

ii) a second universal probe linker which hybridizes to a universal reporter linker of a reporter but does not bind the single stranded target nucleotide sequence (see figure 4C where the sequence between B' and D' binds another probe but does not bind the target sequence),

c) washing to remove any unbound probe (see column 12, lines 11-12, for example which teach removal of the unhybridized complex),

d) hybridizing reporters to the two probe linker (see example 3 and figure 8, where labeled polymer is added for detection),

e) detecting the presence of said reporter to indicate the target sequence (see figure 4C, figure 8 and examples 1-3).

With regard to claim 30, Wang teaches the use of a double stranded reporter that is linked to a universal reporter linker (see figure 4C and column 6, lines 45-65, especially lines 60-61 "A probe can have one attached universal sequence to direct labelled hybridized nucleic acids to a particular location".

With regard to claim 31, Wang teaches probes that are up to 300 bases long (see column 12, lines 9-10).

With regard to claim 32, Wang teaches formation of a reporter array with multiple probes (see figure 6, for example).

Wang does not expressly teach the use of nucleic acid reporter arrays such as those of Urdea

Urdea teaches a method for detecting a target nucleotide sequence (see abstract) comprising:

a) rendering the target nucleotide sequence substantially single stranded to give a single-stranded target nucleotide sequence (see figure 1 and column 11, lines 37-39, where Urdea teaches the use of single stranded target sequence),

b) hybridizing the single stranded target nucleotide sequence with a nucleic acid probe (see figure 1 and column 11, lines 37-45) where the nucleic acid probe comprises a central sequence complementary to the target sequence and further comprises a probe linker at one terminal end which probe linker comprises a single stranded nucleotide sequence that does not hybridize to the target sequence (see figure 1 and column 10, line 61 to column 11, line 7, where the label extender probe comprises a region which hybridizes to the target and a second region which does not hybridize to the target),

where Urdea expressly teaches "incubating the nucleic acid analyte under hybridization conditions with the capture extender molecules, competitor oligonucleotides, label extender molecules and the capture probes on the solid support, simultaneously or sequentially in any order (see claim 2, step b)" thereby directly suggesting that the label molecules may be hybridized to the capture extender molecules prior to hybridization to the target analyte, precisely as required by the claim,

c) washing to remove any unbound probe (see figure 1 and column 11, lines 57-59),

d) joining the reporter to the linker (see figure 1 and column 11, lines 49-65),

e) detecting the presence of said reporter to indicate the target sequence (see figure 1 and column 11, line 65).

With regard to claim 30, Urdea teaches a probe which comprises a first and second terminal probe linker (see figure 16, where the LE has an X and Y region that hybridizes to the Amp1 probe).

With regard to claim 34, Urdea teaches a direct interaction between the reporter and terminal probe linker (see figure 1).

With regard to claims 31, 32, 33, 35, Urdea teaches a multi-linking unit (which is a reporter array) which is double stranded in the interaction with the LE probe which is interposed between the reporter linker and the terminal linkers, where the multilinking unit of figure 8, for example, comprises single stranded regions which hybridize with multiple reporter probes placed end to end which hybridize to the unit which is hybridized to the terminal linkers and where there is a "terminator" or terminal reporter probe (see figures 1, 8 and 16).

With regard to claim 59, many of the Urdea probes comprise a TA sequence including, SEQ ID NO: 35 (see column 23, line 27, for example).

With regard to claim 60, Urdea teaches spacer segments which will comprise carbon (see column 8, lines 10-37, for example).

It would have been prima facie obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the reporter system of Urdea as the signal amplification method in the method of Wang since Urdea teaches "The invention

increases both the sensitivity and specificity of such assays, by reducing the incidence of signal generation that occurs in the absence of target, and does not involve a substantial increase in either time or cost relative to current assay configurations. In certain embodiments, the invention is also effective in compensating for the loss in signal that can result when background noise is reduced. (see column 2, lines 45-51)." An ordinary practitioner, motivated by Wang to improve signal (see column 6, lines 1-40, for example), would have been motivated to use the signal amplification method of Urdea since it would improve sensitivity, specificity and compensate for signal reduction.

Claim Objections

8. Claim 61 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

9. Claim 61 is objected to since the claim incorporates non elected subject matter. This claim cannot currently be allowed because nonelected sequences are present. In order to place the claim in condition for allowance, in addition to rewriting the claim in independent form, the nonelected sequences must be deleted.

10. The elected sequence in claim 61, SEQ ID NO: 76, is novel and unobvious over the prior art because no prior sequence containing SEQ ID NO: 76 was identified in the sequence search.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed October 20, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicant argues that the reporter segments of Wang, as depicted in figure 4C, do not meet the requirements of claim 28 because the segments are hybridized after the probe has hybridized to the target. This argument is found partially persuasive, since Wang does not expressly teach the order of addition matters. However, the 103 rejection will be maintained, because Urdea expressly recognizes that the order of addition of the reporter can be performed in any order. Urdea expressly teaches "incubating the nucleic acid analyte under hybridization conditions with the capture extender molecules, competitor oligonucleotides, label extender molecules and the capture probes on the solid support, simultaneously or sequentially **in any order** (see claim 2, step b)" thereby directly suggesting that the label molecules may be hybridized to the capture extender molecules prior to hybridization to the target analyte, precisely as required by the claim. This use of "any order" directly suggests to the ordinary practitioner that "any order" of hybridization may be used in the method of Wang, which therefore suggests the claimed invention.

Applicant then argues that the probe collection of Wang has practical limitations. This is not relevant since the claims do not have any limitations which implicate these limitations.

Applicant then argues that Wang cannot bind two copies of the same reporter unit. That is not correct, since the structure of Wang would permit multiple hybridizations dependent solely upon the length of the arm.

Applicant argues that the detection mode of Wang differs from that of the instant claims. That argument is irrelevant since no specific detection mode is required by the claims. Further, Urdea teaches the detection mode proposed by Applicant.

Applicant then argues the 103 rejection by stating that the Urdea probe composition is different than that of Wang. The issue is whether it would have been prima facie obvious to add the reagents in "any order" and whether the signal generation method of Urdea would have been used to replace that of Wang. Specific motivation for both of these changes is suggested by Urdea which would have motivated the ordinary practitioner to make the changes for the express advantages taught by Urdea.

Therefore, the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103, is maintained.

Conclusion

12. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not

mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Jeffrey Fredman whose telephone number is (571)272-0742. The examiner can normally be reached on 6:30-3:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Gary Benzion can be reached on (571)272-0782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Jeffrey Fredman
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 1637
12/7/06